

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION**

JENNAH M. GASKINS,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CAUSE NO.: 2:20-CV-328-TLS-JEM
)	
TIMOTHY F. ROSS, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court *sua sponte*. The Court has an ongoing duty to police its subject matter jurisdiction. *Hay v. Ind. State Bd. of Tax Comm'rs*, 312 F.3d 876, 879 (7th Cir. 2002).

On September 11, 2020, Plaintiff filed a Complaint alleging that the District Court has original jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). Diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) requires complete diversity of citizenship between the plaintiff and both defendants and an amount in controversy that exceeds \$75,000. *Neuma, Inc. v. AMP, Inc.*, 259 F.3d 864, 881 (7th Cir. 2001). As the party seeking to invoke federal diversity jurisdiction, Plaintiff bears the burden of demonstrating that the jurisdictional requirements have been met. *Chase v. Shop'n Save Warehouse Foods, Inc.*, 110 F.3d 424, 427 (7th Cir. 1997). Anything less can result in a dismissal. *Mut. Assignment & Indem. Co. v. Lind-Waldock & Co., LLC*, 364 F.3d 858, 861 (7th Cir. 2004).

Plaintiff has not met the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00. Plaintiff alleges that Plaintiff “was injured, some of which injuries may be permanent, incurred medical expenses, lost wages, and was otherwise damaged,” Compl.¶ 12, but does not identify the claimed amount of loss or explain how it was calculated.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to **FILE**, on or before **October 15, 2020**, a supplemental jurisdictional statement demonstrating that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00 as outlined above.

SO ORDERED this 1st day of October, 2020.

s/ John E. Martin
MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOHN E. MARTIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

cc: All counsel of record